

PATENT
Serial No. 09/894,233

Docket No. 1232-4242US3

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 17-34 are rejected and claims 2-7 and 10-16 have been objected to as including allowable subject matter but depending from a rejected base claim. Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 12, 17-21, 27 and 31 are amended as shown below and claims 35 - 46 have been added herein. Claims 1, 8, 19-23, 27, 31, 35, 39 and 43 are independent in form. No new matter has been presented.

Claim Objections

Claims 8, 27 and 31 have been objected to for stated informalities which have been addressed in the amendments to these claims presented herein. Applicants respectfully submit that these objections have been overcome or otherwise rendered moot, and be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8, 9, 17-24, 26-28, 30-32 and 34 been rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Conway (USP 5,444,476) in view of Bates et al. (USP 5,515,491)("Bates") and Takahashi. (USP 5,574,901). Claims 25, 29 and 33 been rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Conway in view of Bates and Takahashi, further in view of Hiramoto et al. (JP 406181539A-machine translation)("Hiramoto").

Applicant does not agree with the stated rejections, and respectfully traverses said rejections. Applicant has herein amended independent claims 1, 8, 19, 20, 21, 27, 31 to further clarify the claimed invention and submits that they, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

16/19

8863911 v1

PATENTDocket No. 1232-4242US3

Serial No. 09/894,233

Conway teaches, at col. 9, lines 51-55, that a network interface 37e, 37e' sends and receives direction control signals of a video camera to and from local and remote locations as well as functions as an arbitrator between teleconference sites simultaneously attempting to position the video camera. However, Conway does not teach any detail of the arbitration executed by the network interface 37e, 37e'. As stated by the Examiner, arbitration in Conway controls the order of operation using priority or first-come-first-serve (as described in page 3, lines 4-5 of Office Action). According to the arbitration taught by Conway, a period, when an operation command outputted by a user is not executed, occurs as the result of the arbitration, however, the operation of the user is not always prohibited. In other words, Conway does not teach the present invention as claimed which is characterized in that the user's operation is dynamically prohibited in accordance with status of an operation by another user.

While Bates teaches reading and manipulation of an object in a user, in a collaborated data processing system, it is apparent however that Bates does not dynamically prohibit the user's operation in accordance with the status of an operation by another user as detailed in Bates at col. 2, lines 5-7 of the specification where it is stated: "the interface is supported by software allowing multiple simultaneous access to an object with the right to manipulate the contents of the object."

Takahashi teaches reading or writing of an object in a user, and control of user's access to an object in accordance with a permission of access to the object of another user. However, Takahashi merely executes the control based on permissions of access to an object set in advance and fixed. In other words, Takahashi does not control the user's access to an object based on status of an operation by another user which is dynamically changed.

17/19

886391 v1

PATENT
Serial No. 09/894,233

Docket No. 1232-4242US3

Accordingly, neither Conway, Bates or Takahashi taken alone or in combination teach or suggest at least the above mentioned characteristic of the claimed invention of dynamically prohibiting operation. The present invention is thus believed allowable over these references. Further, since Bates does not teach or suggest a table storing management information as in the present invention, and the table of Takahashi is not a table which is dynamically changed to use in arbitration, the combination of Conway, Bates and Takahashi cannot teach or suggest the present invention as claimed.

Therefore, the present invention as recited in each of the independent claims is clearly distinguishable from Conway, Bates and Takahashi in at least the respects set forth above and is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Conway, Bates and Takahashi taken individually or in combination for at least the reasons stated.

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because these claims directly or indirectly depend from the independent claims which are believed allowable as set forth above, and such dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as for the independent claims from which they depend. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as recited in the claims as presented herein are allowable over the art of record, and respectfully request that the respective rejections and objections be withdrawn.

18/19

886391 v1

PATENT
Serial No. 09/894,233

Docket No. 1232-4242US3

New Claims 35-46

Claims 35-46 have been added to recite the claimed invention in an alternative manner. These claims each recite similar features to those discussed above, including dynamic prohibition of operation. Claims 35-46 are accordingly believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons as stated for claims 1-34.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Applicant believes no extension of time is required for this filing. Should an extension of time be necessary to render this filing timely, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4242US3.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:


Stephen J. Manetta
Registration No. 40,426

Dated: December 10, 2004

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281
(212) 415-8700
(212) 415-8701(facsimile)

19/19

88639 v1